



TOWN OF RANDOLPH, VERMONT

Zoning and Planning Office

zoning@randolphvt.org

802.728.5433 x13

MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, January 4, 2022 at 6:30pm

Town Hall – 7 Summer Street

Members Present: Sonny Holt, Perry Armstrong, Camden Walters, Paul Rea and Jeff Grout

Members Absent: Miles Hooper

Staff: Joshua Jerome

Mr. Holt called the meeting to order at 6:35 pm:

1. **Public Comment** – There was no public comment.
2. **Approval of Agenda** – Motion made by Perry Armstrong, Seconded by Camden Walters – all voted to approve the agenda (5-0-0)
3. **Approval of Minutes** – Motion made by Paul Rea, Seconded by Perry Armstrong to approve the minutes of December 7, 2021. All voted in favor (5-0-0)
4. **New Business**
 - a. **Planning Commission Responsibilities:** Discussion on areas of responsibility for the Planning Commission in accordance with State statutes. Mr. Holt opened up the discussion with describing a bit of what the state statute allows the planning commission to work on and highlighted their work on the town plan and the land use regulations and asked members what else the body should be working on. Mr. Rea mentioned that he thought the PC was doing a good job in tweaking the LUR's when needed, need some feedback from the DRB on what else to change. A discussion on the use of the Design Review Advisory Committee and the Randolph Center Design Committee's; Mr. Jerome said that there's only one person on RCDC and have only had one application in the last two years which was for a shed demolition and rebuild. Mr. Armstrong said that much of the interchange area has been conserved now and questioned the need for the DRAC. Mr. Jerome said that the most recent application from McDonald's was a good example showing that the DRAC may not be necessary. Someone suggested that we gather suggestions of things to change over the next six to nine months before going to the Selectboard. Mr. Holt asked whether it made sense for the DRB and the PC share members and there was concern that trying to get individuals as

alternates to a different committee would be very challenging, many of the committees are already challenged with having too few resident participation. A motion was made by Paul Rea to keep the focus of the PC to the town plan and the land use regulations, seconded by Camden Walters and all voted in favor (5-0-0).

- b. Cannabis Control Commission:** Mr. Jerome brought up to the PC that the Cannabis Control Board was releasing rules for the role out of the cannabis sector and asked the PC to consider forming a Cannabis Control Commission. There had been an expectation that the CCB would come out with rules for local officials to guide themselves through the process, but no such rules have been created. Mr. Jerome said there was at least one person interested in cultivating and presumed there would be more. There was some concern doing anything prior to seeing all of the rules by the CCB. A motion was made by Perry Armstrong to table the conversation until February's meeting, seconded by Walter Camden and all voted in favor (5-0-0)
- c. Two-lot Subdivision:** Mr. Jerome requested the PC provide more clarity on §506.B.1.c in how it should be interpreted. The question at hand; does someone who uses the two-lot subdivision waiver restricted to using it once, or are they restricted in subdividing their property once as the language in the LUR's can be interpreted both ways. Mr. Rea and Mr. Armstrong both suggested that it was designed for someone who might have some land and wants to subdivide a parcel off for a family member. Was meant to be a more efficient process and only used once, but parcels can be subdivided again using the full review process. Mr. Rea brought up the desire to have a different review process for just two-lot subdivisions, an administrative process. Mr. Jerome said he had heard from another zoning administrator that they have a different process for minor subdivisions where the ZA can review, but still requires the same warning and public meeting process. A change in the LUR's would need to be made in order to change the process. A motion was made by Sonny Holt to change the process of review through a bylaw change to go to the Selectboard, seconded by Perry Armstrong and all voted in favor (5-0-0)
- d. Minimum Building Size Requirement for the Gateway Commercial Retail District:** The item was brought up after the recent DRB meeting where someone is proposing to open up a restaurant in the former automotive repair business next to Shaw's and was seeking a waiver from the DRB as there is a 4,000 sq/ft minimum. There was a general conversation about why there is a 4,000 minimum. Mr. Armstrong believed to recall it was suggested by TRORC as a way to prevent sprawl. Mr. Jerome stated that he was not in favor of changing it as it does create more opportunities for sprawl. Mr. Rea was less worried about sprawl and mentioned that the downtown was fairly full and not much available space. There was a discussion on if there needs to be a minimum requirement, why should it be just down to 2,500. There was agreement that 4,000 sq/ft seemed to be to strict, but having no minimum might open up the district to sprawl and take away from the downtown. There was conversation about whether the Classification needs to change from conditional use to permitted, as there are several commercial

buildings. Mr. Walters said he was reluctant to go from one extreme to the other, so just allowing it in existing buildings might allow that. Mr. Rea mentioned that if they're considering a change for the commercial group service category that they should look at the indoor retail use category since it has the same size limitation. **Paul Rea made the motion to change the land use regulations to change the size minimum requirement from 4,000 to 2,500 for commercial group services and indoor retail as long as it is in an existing building, seconded by Perry Armstrong and all voted in favor (5-0-0).**

5. Other Business: Mobile Homes – this was brought up during the October meeting by Mr. Jerome looking for clarification on how a hypothetical situation where a parcel could have up to five homeless shelters sited on it. The shelters would be on a single chassis and be occupied for less than six months. Under §408 Recreational Vehicles as Residences: it says that any RV on a lot for more than six months shall be considered a single-family dwelling and must meet all setbacks. The question is: if the units are there for less than six months, do they need a zoning permit to site them on the property? What are they considered prior to six months? Some discussion on whether they would be considered an RV or a dwelling. The homeless shelter does not meet the definition of a dwelling or RV.

6. Adjournment: Perry Armstrong made the motion to adjourn at 9:30, Camden Walters seconded and all voted in favor (5-0-0)

Respectfully submitted: Joshua Jerome